

**BOARD OF HEALTH – TOWNSHIP OF MENDHAM  
MEETING MINUTES  
June 22, 2021 – 7:30 P.M.**

**CALL TO ORDER:** *Wendy Parrinello, Board Secretary*

**STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE**

Adequate Notice of this meeting of the Board of Health of the Township of Mendham was given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act as follows: Notice was given to the Observer Tribune and Daily Record on February 8, 2021. Notice was posted on the bulletin board in the Township offices and notice was filed with the Township Clerk.

**SALUTE TO THE FLAG:** *Led by Benjamin Weber*

**THOSE IN ATTENDANCE:**

Ms. Reale  
Mr. Smith  
Mr. Weber  
Mr. Atkins, Alternate 1

**APPROVAL OF May 25, 2021 MINUTES**

Mr. Smith makes a motion to accept the minutes as corrected. Ms. Reale seconds the motion.

**ROLL CALL: YES** – Ms. Reale, Mr. Smith, Mr. Weber, Mr. Atkins

**BUSINESS**

APPLICANT: Mendham Township

SUBJECT: Emergency Repairs – Brookside Beach Septic System – Township Representation  
– Bob Casey, Interim Administrator

- Mr. Bob Casey, Interim Administrator of Mendham Township is in attendance as the representative of the recreational establishment, Brookside Beach.
- Mr. Casey explains that the last time the septic system was pumped, the holding tank backfilled with water – the leach field is saturated.
- Brookside Beach is currently using Porta John’s for bathroom facilities and the Township would like to discontinue the use of these “bathrooms” for the foreseeable future. As a temporary measure, Mr. Casey is proposing an enclosed system on a pump system – temporarily disconnecting the leach field from the holding tank by cutting and capping the pipe. A static test, at a minimum, would be completed to make sure that the holding tank structure is sound. Weekly or bi-weekly pumping would be required.

- Mr. Casey states that he is aware that formal approval of a more permanent solution will ultimately need to take place, by way of an application to the Board of Health and to the Department of Environmental Protection.
- Mr. Weber asks if there is some process by which the holding tank can be tested to make sure that it's sound.
- Mr. Casey explains that a basic static test would be performed – a measured amount of water would be left in the tank for 24 -48 hours and after that time, if the same amount of water is in the tank, it's said to be sound.
- Mr. Weber asks what the process is for determining when the system needs pumping. Mr. Casey states that the recreation department will have a set schedule. They will also measure the tank periodically and a more fluid schedule will be worked out once a feel for the loading is determined.
- Mr. Weber asks what formal action is the Township asking the Board to take. Mr. Casey explains that the Township is seeking temporary emergency use of a holding tank until a formal application and all the details required can be completed.
- With regards to a holding tank, Ms. Freer reads from the memo given to the Board of Health, and which is on file in the BOH office, in summary that, the local health authority may approve the use of a temporary sanitary sewage-holding tank where alteration or repair of an existing system is being implemented, not while the system is being examined to determine its viability (attached, 3.12 (holding tanks) – in BOH office).
- Mr. Weber asks Mr. Casey for clarification as to whether this proposal is being done on a temporary basis for an alternate solution or if this is being done so that this is the repeat solution each summer.
- Mr. Casey states that he would like this to be the permanent solution and that it takes the approval of the Board of Health and the Department of Environmental Protection, however the reality is that a new septic system would never be approved in that location, being within 50 ft of the stream. A holding tank is the best solution for the long run. Mr. Casey is asking the Board for a temporary emergency use of a holding tank until the paperwork is completed for a more permanent solution.
- Mr. Weber asks if there's a schedule in mind for when the formal material will be available for Board review. Mr. Casey states that paperwork is likely to be completed by the end of the summer. This project became a discussion of the Governing Body in late May. Some members of the Governing Body along with local parents, wanted to make the facilities more user friendly.
- In the long run, Mr. Casey explains that a larger holding tank, in the ground, in the same location as the current tank, with greater capacity when the flows are better known and with regular pumping, will be proposed.
- Mr. Weber confirms with Mr. Mills that the Board would provide a temporary approval for the system that Mr. Casey has explained. Mr. Mills states that that's correct and that if the Board is inclined, the motion would be pursuant to Section 3.12 - to approve on an emergency temporary basis the holding tank subject to the fact that the Township needs to demonstrate the security of the tank so that it's not leaking or allowing effluent to escape. The temporary approval is not to exceed 180

days and the Township will need to come back to the Board with a proposal for a more permanent solution.

- Mr. Atkins asks if the holding tank is in a better location than the leach field. Mr. Casey says, yes, that the holding tank is adjacent to the bathrooms.
- Mr. Smith asks if the two bathrooms at Brookside Beach have been looked at recently. Mr. Casey explains that there's money in the budget to bring the bathrooms up to compliance as well as to verify the soundness of the existing connection from the bathrooms to the holding tank.
- Mr. Smith asks if the upgrades will be ADA compliant. Mr. Casey states that they can make an ADA compliant system with the use of mats. Mr. Casey states that the ADA compliant measures, as far as the hardened surfacing is concerned, is not included in the budget numbers.
- Mr. Smith states that in the letter from the Township, wording should be changed to from 'distribution box' to 'holding tank.' Mr. Casey states that he will do that.
- Mr. Weber asks if there are additional questions from the Board or if members from the Zoom meeting would like to speak.
- Mr. Weber is prepared to propose a motion, approving this application, as Mr. Mills outlined it for the emergency temporary use of a holding tank in the ground subject to first working with the consultants to verify soundness of the tank; closing off the tank from the leach field; having a regular 'sticking' process to determine when the tank is filling up; returning in August with drawings and a formal application. Mr. Smith seconds the motion.

#### ROLL CALL VOTE – YES

Ms. Reale  
Mr. Smith  
Mr. Weber  
Mr. Atkins

#### BLOCK 132 LOT 8

APPLICANT: STAR TRADING GROUP – RAMEZ SAMUEL

APPLICATION: Alteration Expansion/Change in Use – 27 Brockden Drive – Parker Engineering and Surveying, P.C., Stephen Parker

\*\*Permit Approval: Freshwater Wetlands General Permit No. GP24

- Mr. Lee Levitt, attorney for the applicant, Ramez Samuel, owner of 27 Brockden Drive, LLC and Star Trading Group, is in attendance. Mr. Levitt states that Mr. Parker, engineer and Mr. Carbella, architect, both for 27 Brockden Drive are joining this meeting via Zoom.
- Mr. Weber states that this is the 3<sup>rd</sup> time that this project has been brought to the Board. Mr. Weber explains that at the last Board meeting, Mr. Levitt asked that the Board suspend their vote – Mr. Weber states that the Board is in receipt of Mr. Levitt's letter, written on June 15, 2021. Prior to the BOH meeting, Mr. Weber spoke with Mr. Samuel and has informed the members of the Board of that conversation.

- Mr. Levitt explains that during his appearance at the last meeting, the Board expressed several concerns, particularly with regards to the history, the procedural aspects behind this application. and why 27 Brockden, LLC failed to come before the Board prior to obtaining the building permits that were issued by the Mendham Township Building Department. Mr. Levitt continues that the vote by the Board was graciously suspended so that additional information could be accumulated - about the property, about Mr. Samuels' building and renovation background, and also, whether there was an engineer on this project prior to Mr. Parker. Mr. Levitt would like to address the fact pattern for the application as well as the concern that a potential precedent could be set if this Board were to approve the application.
- Mr. Levitt states that his letter, dated June 15, 2021, attempted to alleviate any of the concerns that the Board had expressed.
- Ms. Freer states that she and Mr. Korshalla have no further comments on the septic plans.
- Mr. Weber explains that this is an unfortunate circumstance – that there's a new structure on the lot, which is much larger than the original home. Mr. Weber states that he believes Mr. Parker was attempting to do septic investigation in the fall, while construction was underway, and that Mr. Parker may not have realized that there was an increase in the size of the building. Mr. Weber asks that Mr. Parker speak to that.
- Mr. Parker explains that Parker Engineering was engaged to do septic investigation for 27 Brockden Drive during the fall. At that time, work was well underway and the second story of the home had been completed.
- Mr. Weber states that the Board has been struggling with whether the septic system was failing at the time the LLC acquired the property. Mr. Weber asks Mr. Levitt if he is familiar with the Township Ordinance 383-18 – the Certificate for Continued Use for a septic system. Mr. Levitt states, no.
- Mr. Weber explains that the Township ordinance formally requires, before title transfers, that the seller provide the Certificate for Continued Use and that if a certificate is not able to be issued, a Temporary Certificate for Continued Use can be granted. Mr. Weber adds that there's a penalty for not complying with this act – it's \$200 and \$25 each day after.
- Mr. Weber challenges Mr. Levitt's letter, dated June 15, 2021, which states that the application is compliant in all respects. However, not having obtained the Certificate for Continued Use is a defect in the application.
- Mr. Levitt asks who issues the Certificate for Continued Use. Ms. Freer explains that issuance of the CCU is given from the Township, based on the result of a satisfactory septic inspection report – it's \$45 for the certificate. If a septic repair or replacement cannot be granted prior to a closing, the following steps can be taken in order to obtain a Temporary Certificate for Continued Use:
  - a. Prior to the close of the home, seller/purchaser will need to have an engineer or contractor give an estimate of the cost to replace/repair the septic.
  - b. 120% of the engineers/contractor's estimate will be held in an attorney's trust account.
  - c. A letter from the attorney, along with the estimated septic cost will need to be sent to the Mendham Township Department of Health.

- d. The letter and estimate will be sent to the departmental engineer for approval.
  - e. Once approved, issuance of a Temporary Certificate for Continued Use of an Existing Individual Subsurface Disposal System is granted. The certificate is issued upon the understanding that the system will be repaired or replaced within 6 months from the issue of the Temporary Certificate. If the replacement/repair is not completed within 6 months, it may be required that purchaser vacate the premises.
- Mr. Weber explains that while Mr. Levitt's letter is appreciated, it isn't correct in stating that all measures were properly taken. Mr. Weber points out that the plans do not comply with the 25 ft. set back.
  - Mr. Parker states that the Mendham Township ordinance does not consider a right of way line to be a property line for that 25 ft. set back requirement. Mr. Weber states that the Board is routinely asked for waivers based on that differential between city and state and the 25 ft. rule. Mr. Weber asks if a waiver is being requested based on the Township ordinance.
  - Mr. Levitt states that after speaking with Mr. Parker, it was determined that based on the writing of the Township ordinance, a waiver was not required.
  - Mr. Weber states that often times the Board has had to consider a request for a waiver when there is a road. The interpretation is inconsistent with what the Board has voted on in the past.
  - Mr. Parker reads from the septic plans, which states a municipal street should not be considered to be an adjacent lot - for purposes of this paragraph – the paragraph that requires a 25 ft. set back to the property line.
  - Mr. Weber explains that the Board is challenged with the fact that the property is 99% wetlands and the vast majority of the lot could not be built on today. The Board's responsibility is to enforce the rules that are designed to limit more effluent from going into the waterways.
  - Mr. Weber states that the architectural drawings do not show any plans to the basement and asks if there have been changes to the basement. Mr. Levitt directs Mr. Weber's question to the architect, Mr. Carbella.
  - Mr. Carbella explains that the original basement was divided into many different rooms. Mr. Carbella states that the dividing walls have been taken down and the basement has been developed into larger spaces for exercise and family living.
  - Mr. Weber references drawing A, 1.02, pg. 11, labeled, existing basement plan and would like to know if this is a portrayal of how the basement appears today. Mr. Weber points out the exercise room and a powder room and would like to know if there's a shower. Mr. Carbella states, no, there is no shower.
  - Mr. Weber explains that the Board has the ability to evaluate a plan and to consider as a potential bedroom any room that seemingly looks like a bedroom, for example, an office space. Based on Mr. Korshalla's memo, the Board has to determine whether this plan is for 5 bedrooms or something else.
  - Mr. Levitt would like clarification on whether the Board has the discretion to determine whether something could be a bedroom or not – what is that based on?
  - Mr. Weber states that the consultants highlighted the labeled 'offices' and that the determination is a judgement of the Board.

- Mr. Smith would like to know what the applicant will do to make this a three-bedroom home.
- Mr. Levitt explains that this is not a choice for the applicant. That unfortunately, the Township's internal procedures did not come to fruition; full building permits for an expansion from a three-bedroom to a five-bedroom dwelling were approved prior to approval of a septic expansion. Whatever the failure as to why a CCU was not issued, the property was sold to the LLC. Prior to purchase, the buyer and the seller knew that there was a problem with the septic system.
- Mr. Levitt explains that prior to buying the property, Mr. Samuel contacted Hercules Septic company. Hercules septic put Mr. Samuel's in touch with Mr. Parker. A septic design was completed to repair and enlarge the septic system. As soon as Mr. Samuel realized that this application needed Board of Health approval, construction work stopped. Mr. Levitt continues that ultimately a GP24 was issued from the DEP.
- Mr. Weber and Mr. Smith state that that is not a true statement and that work had not stopped in the fall when this was flagged as a problem. It's stated that when Mr. Parker came before this Board with the application for 27 Brockden Drive, he was asked the status of the project and Mr. Parker, at that time, stated that the project was moving along and that likely dry-wall was up and that he would speak with the owner regarding the home.
- Mr. Samuel explains that he is a physician and an investor and that when it comes to building, he relies on his professionals, i.e., realtors, architects, engineers, for their opinions and expertise. Mr. Samuel continues that building permits were issued in August and that Mr. Parker had the application in September. Building work was beginning while Mr. Parker had the application. Mr. Parker reviewed the application in December. By January, Mr. Parker brought the plans before the Board of Health and by then the building was nearly complete.
- Mr. Weber asks Mr. Samuel if when he received the permits and hired Mr. Parker, did he let Mr. Parker know that the home was going from a three-bedroom to a five-bedroom home. Mr. Samuel says no, that he connected the architect, Mr. Carbella with Mr. Parker. Mr. Samuel states that he wanted the professionals to connect so that all of the professional information would be accurate.
- Mr. Smith states that the professionals should be held more accountable.
- Mr. Weber states that the principal that hired the agents should take responsibility for the mistakes of the agents.
- Mr. Weber states that in light of the comment from the architect - the goal was to create a home that could accommodate a very large family.
- Mr. Levitt clarifies that the architect defines a large family as 5 to 7 people and that the point to the Board, as the septic system sits today, as designed and as approved by the DEP, and in compliance in all respects - is that the applicant asks for approval of the application, as it complies in all respects to municipal, county and state regulations.
- Mr. Weber explains that the State waiver does not override the municipalities authority to either approve or not approve putting a reserve in a wetland or in a transition area.

- Mr. Mills explains to Mr. Levitt that the applicant was in possession of a septic inspection report indicating that the septic system was in a failure mode prior to closing title. The applicant elected to close title – it was not a matter of the municipality allowing him to close. Mr. Mills explains that the due diligence is on the owner to determine whether or not the septic system could be reconstructed for a three-bedroom, much less an expansion to a five-bedroom.
- Mr. Levitt states that it's harmless error as to what occurred prior to this application. We are here, asking the Board to allow what has now gone through the DEP and been approved for a compliant system. This is a vast improvement from what previously existed – this is a more compliant system as a whole. Mr. Levitt agrees with the Board that there were many procedural mistakes with regards to this application.
- Mr. Smith questions the construction and sale of the home.
- Mr. Samuel explains that realtor, Eileen Scott spoke with Mr. Parker prior to the home expansion and states that Mr. Parker gave them 'the green light.' Mr. Samuel continues that the project wouldn't have continued if Mr. Parker didn't give them 'the green light.'
- Ms. Freer explains that in November, she met Mr. Parker at the property to conduct soil logs and that the renovations were already underway. At that visit, Ms. Freer states that she asked Mr. Parker if the applicant was expanding the home and Mr. Parker stated that he thought that they were only making the rooms bigger. Mr. Parker was not aware of the expansion at that time. Ms. Freer continues to explain that in December she met with Mr. Parker, at the property, to conduct additional soil logs, after Mr. Parker found out that the applicant was expanding the home.
- Ms. Freer explains that according to the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, any room that the administrative authority feels can be reasonably used as a bedroom can be required to be counted for the determination of the volume of sanitary sewage for design flow purposes, regardless of what the room is labeled on engineering or architectural plans. The Board is able to determine if those 'offices' can be used as bedrooms.
- Ms. Freer continues to explain that in speaking with the DEP, while they (DEP) may have issued General Permit 24, it ultimately comes down to the Mendham Township Board of Health as to whether the application should be approved or not.
- Mr. Parker confirms that he was not aware of the expansion when he was there for soil logs in November. Mr. Parker continues to explain that in December, he became aware of an expansion and that additional soil logs were required for a reserve area. It was at that point that Mr. Parker pointed out that since it was an expansion, wetlands would need to be addressed. Mr. Kruger, the wetlands consultant was engaged at that time.
- Mr. Levitt states, again, that there is a procedural error here, by the applicant. The applicant relies on the professionals and the moment that an issue arose, it was addressed. The intention of the applicant was always to expand the home. There is no precedence set, only that there needs to be more safeguards in place so that this type of situation does not occur when you have a conforming septic system in place.
- Mr. Weber states that the precedent, if there is one, is that if one does a private sale and doesn't bother with the septic certificate for continued use, and if the building

department has given approval and permits – then one can say that it is too late – the work is done. In this instance, the applicant relied on consultants and the consultants were not communicating. Mr. Weber explains that this Board needs to consider whether or not this is really a five-bedroom application. The system has a reserve area in a wetland and that is not a compliant situation.

- Mr. Parker confirms that much of the property is covered in wetlands and wetland transition area and that there is a small portion in the front right corner of the property that is outside of those regulated areas. There is no clearing of wetlands vegetation as there is a lawn there. Even though they are in a transition area, The DEP approved both the new disposal system as well as the reserve area.
- Mr. Levitt asks Mr. Parker if the grey water system had any implication on General Permit 24 - that the grey water was being eliminated. Mr. Parker explains that on the plans, it does show that the grey water is to be abandoned and that the new plans would be an improvement over what is there, and that it would be in full conformance with the code. The DEP has all the justification that they need in order to approve the application.
- Mr. Weber explains that upon Mr. Parker applying for the GP24, it was made clear by the Board that the application state that the Mendham Township Board of Health objects to the application.
- Mr. Levitt asks if this was a withdrawal of an application in January. Mr. Weber explains that in January, the application was formerly withdrawn. When the Board met again, there was a motion on the table, which would have failed the application - the vote would have been no. Mr. Parker asked that the vote be suspended.
- Mr. Weber explains that the Boards obligation is whether to allow a system that relies on a reserve in a wetland, and that if this is in fact a seven-bedroom home, then the size of the bed is not compliant.
- Mr. Levitt suggests that perhaps an architectural adjustment could relieve a lot of the concerns that the Board of Health has. Mr. Levitt continues that there were procedural mistakes all around and that the applicant has acted in good faith in attempting to get a compliant system that is smaller than the initial system. Some field modifications could be a solution in this application and Mr. Levitt explains that they are looking to meet on middle ground with adjustments in order to alleviate concerns. There has been no indication of 'slipping by' or 'do now and ask for forgiveness later.'
- Mr. Weber asks Mr. Levitt to speak to the comment of 'slipping by.' This house was on the market, shown as sold and Mr. Mills had to send a letter. This was a private transaction and a Certificate for Continued Use was not issued. What has happened in this instance?
- Mr. Samuel states that before listing the home, Ms. Scott reached out to Mr. Parker and Mr. Parker gave the 'green light' to go on the market. Mr. Samuel continues to explain that Ms. Scott and Mr. Carbella contacted him – that he did not know that the property was for sale prior to their reaching out.
- Mr. Weber states that the responsibility is ultimately on the applicant.



- Mr. Smith asks if Mr. Samuel is willing to speak with the architect about having 4 large bedrooms. Mr. Samuel says that it's impossible. Mr. Smith states that he will not approve 5 bedrooms.
- Mr. Levitt asks if the Board would be more comfortable if a bathroom and the two bedrooms were removed in order to alleviate the concern of the 'offices' being bedrooms.
- Mr. Atkins asks Mr. Samuel if he has anyone working to coordinate all of the consultants and contractors or is it only a general contractor that deals with all of the consultants. Mr. Samuel states that he has a general contractor, but that the contractor is not aware of all the septic codes. There's no one necessarily coordinating the job, however.
- Mr. Weber states that there are parties in attendance here that are in violation of an ordinance that should be fined and could have an accumulation of roughly \$10,000 in fines for not having complied with the ordinance.
- Mr. Samuel explains that he never knew that he shouldn't have built a large home on the property – none of the consultants informed him that he could not expand this home on this property.
- Mr. Weber states that it doesn't make sense to allow this septic overload effectively in this part of town, next to the creek, just because the consultants were not informative.
- Mr. Levitt states that the reason for going to the DEP was because of a system overload – it was necessary to obtain the GP24; ultimately, the system is smaller than what was previously there and it will adequately handle the five-bedroom home.
- Mr. Weber responds that, it's true that the system can disperse the effluent through the tubes, but it's also a configuration that produces a lot more that goes into the ground water. The fact that it's consistent with the statute doesn't mean that it isn't putting a lot more effluent into the ground water at the top of a hill that leads right down to a creek. The Board has the discretion in deciding whether to allow the reserve area in the back or not in order to help to avoid creating that situation.
- Mr. Samuel asks for mercy in this situation, he cannot work effectively and it's putting stress on him mentally and physically. Mr. Samuel feels that the improvement to this home is helping the community and the Town.
- Mr. Smith responds that this home on Brockden Drive does not fit with the neighborhood – the homes on Brockden are moderately sized.
- Mr. Levitt asks if the Board has any suggestions as to what to do with the existing rooms. What will make the Board comfortable? Mr. Smith suggests that Mr. Levitt speak with the architect, Mr. Carbella.
- Mr. Weber states that while Mr. Levitt and Mr. Samuel consult with Mr. Carbella, the Board will be move forward with the next application.

\*\*27 Brockden will resume following 12 Schoolhouse Lane\*\*

BLOCK 127 LOT 89

APPLICANT: Beverly Polo

APPLICATION: Alteration/Expansion – 12 Schoolhouse Lane – Careaga Engineering, Inc. – Robin Sellitto

- Ms. Sellitto from Careaga Engineering is representing the application for 12 Schoolhouse Lane. This application is before the Board for an expansion. The house was built in 1965 as a three-bedroom home. It's currently a five-bedroom home. There are no architectural plans for the expansion, as the two additional bedrooms were completed in 1979 and 1980.
- Ms. Sellitto explains that there is an existing 1000g septic tank, which will remain. There is a seepage pit that will be abandoned in place. Careaga is proposing a 500g septic tank to accommodate for the additional flow for the bedrooms. It will be going to a gravity disposal field. All setbacks are met for the disposal field, the reserve area and the well. There's no septic within 150 ft. of the neighbor's property and to where they're proposing the disposal field.
- Mr. Weber asks that Ms. Freer confirms that the Board does not have anything to include. Ms. Freer states that Mr. Korshalla, in his memo, suggested an additional soil log be done, however, that it's not necessary because the three required soil logs have been done, and that it's at the Board's discretion.
- Mr. Smith asks as to whether construction on the two adjacent properties would affect septic work at 12 Schoolhouse Lane. Ms. Sellitto states that any property around the dwelling would not affect it because it's so far removed.
- Mr. Smith asks if the dwelling went to a five-bedroom with an upgraded system. Ms. Sellitto states that the owners went to a five-bedroom without an upgraded system. It's a 1000g septic tank with a seepage pit. There are no records in the Board of Health that indicate the system was ever upgraded.
- Mr. Weber asks if the septic system is failing or if they're only doing the project to bring it up to code. Ms. Sellitto states it's likely that the owners would like to sell the home in the near future.
- Mr. Weber asks if there are questions from the Board.
- Mr. Weber makes a motion to approve the application as presented. Mr. Smith seconds the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE – YES

Ms. Reale  
Mr. Smith  
Mr. Weber  
Mr. Atkins

APPLICATION: Alteration Expansion/Change in Use – 27 Brockden Drive – Parker Engineering and Surveying, P.C., Stephen Parker

**\*\*Continuing\*\***

- Mr. Levitt explains that he has had the opportunity to caucus with the applicant, Mr. Samuel and the architect, Mr. Carbella. Mr. Levitt would like to propose to the Board

that the applicant would agree to go to a four-bedroom dwelling. The architect indicates that the walls could be removed in the second-floor master bedroom. The 'office' wall would be taken down, which would provide a sitting area in the master bedroom space. Mr. Levitt continues that the first floor 'office' would undergo an alteration, removing the wall – the space would be incorporated into the master bedroom and the laundry area would be relocated. On the second floor, the bedroom and walk-in closet would both become a part of the 'breeze area room.' This is the applicant's proposal in an effort to resolve the current situation.

- Mr. Mills would like the revised plans subject to scrutiny by Ms. Freer and Mr. Korshalla.
- Mr. Levitt states that permits will be needed, from the Building Department, for the elimination of the walls.
- Mr. Smith confirms that 27 Brockden Drive will then be marketed and advertised as a four-bedroom home.
- Mr. Smith asks if anyone is occupying the home now. Mr. Samuel states, no.
- Mr. Mills suggests that the contract purchaser sign an acknowledgement, memorializing what has been discussed at the Board Meetings regarding 27 Brockden Drive – that it's acknowledged that the septic system is sized to accommodate a four-bedroom dwelling and that the dwelling not be used for more than four bedrooms.
- Ms. Freer states that the County and the Township has a Statement of Bedroom Confirmation form – the document is required to be notarized and filed with the County Clerk.
- Mr. Weber states that updated drawings should be provided to the Board and brought to the next meeting, Tuesday, July 27.
- Mr. Mills explains that once approved, the project would not be subject to memorialization – the Board would grant whatever is needed to move forward.
- Mr. Weber confirms that if a four-bedroom dwelling can be illustrated and voted on at the next meeting, this could move forward rather quickly.
- Mr. Levitt states that all departments will be kept in the loop with updated architectural designs and that updated drawings will be submitted to all appropriate parties.

## **HEALTH OFFICER'S MONTHLY REPORT**

Reviewed by Ms. Freer. Full reports available in the Board of Health Office

*May 2021*

- Health Officer and Assistant Health Officer duties remain the same. They are involved with the septic applications and 27 Brockden Drive has been discussed at length with them.
- Communicable disease cases have continued to drop.
- The CDRSS report indicates that there are 8 COVID-19 cases and 1 Lyme Disease case. Overall Lyme numbers are very high with Morris County being one of the highest in Lyme's Disease cases.
- No animal bites recorded.

**General Correspondence**

**Meeting Adjourned: 9:49 pm**